

Dear esteemed chairs, vice-chairs, ranking members and members of the committee,

I am taking this opportunity to testify in support of the concept behind this bill, however I am quite concerned in the fact that this bill is very vague and would be inefficient passed as is.

1. I am not confident that DCP should be the entity that administers the program, nor am i convinced they can.

2. I would like to point that as there are still many supermarkets that do not donate foods, and that produce a lot of waste, which is why we need a mandate.

3. There is a clear dismissal, of Food Recovery Organizations. Those entities are not considered food banks and are based on mutual aid. These are people organizing food recovery and donations and fill the gap that no one else is filling. They get no financial help from federal nor from state.

As a matter of fact, our controversial CT Food Share, does not donate food to those entities, as well as seems to run itself in a monarchical way, dismissing food banks there seems to be disagreements with, on a personal level or also could be based on some lack of complacency that we need to review, i believe . I have witnessed this in Stamford and have heard of many more such instances across the state.

I would strongly suggest that if this bill's language is worked on, another section be made for the Food Recovery Organizations (FRO), so that for the purposes of this bill they be treated equally to food banks. Additionally I d also suggest to add language that would "enable" food banks to donate to FROs at any time.

FROs also have needs for their own infrastructure as the donations or recovery of certain products necessitate refrigeration so it does not become waste, and the idea of an infrastructure (fridges) needs to be addressed.

4. Such bill being so vague necessitates some serious work in terms of details. That starts with what is the definition of "excess" foods? What size supermarkets? What tonnage of foods..etc.

5. I appreciate and agree with tax credits but it should be explored further in regards to FROs and food banks as well. The liability language is also good as it seems to be more precise than the Emerson Act.

As the state brags about the funding available in the rainy day fund, we have people with not enough foods or no access to food.

It is raining!

Please consider redrafting a precise and inclusive language that will ensure all supermarkets donate, and that donations go to all entities that are public or private and give food at no cost.

If we are going to work on this bill, let s make it a proper bill, and not an ineffective piece of legislation that has a clear lack of details, and that could potentially block efforts to bring in a proper legislative approach and resolve to this issue and food waste and how it can help resolve some of the hunger in our state.

Kind regards

Rep. Michel

